

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10, 16-44, 46 and 47 are rejected. Claims 11-15 and 45 are objected to. Claim 26 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 21, 26, 39 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Independent claims 1, 21, 26, 39 and 46 are rejected as being anticipated by *Maggenti*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 teaches a “method of implementing a network of devices connected to a shared media...comprising: forming a logical network on the shared media, the logical network including an address space arbiter (ASA) coupled to the shared media...”

Maggenti does not disclose a method for implementing a network of devices connected to a shared media as described in Applicants’ claim 1. Instead, *Maggenti* discloses a communications manager that receives transmission privilege requests from group communication devices. The communications manager of *Maggenti* is not comparable to the address space arbiter of Applicants’ claim 1.

Applicants’ claim 1 further teaches a “logical network having a logical network ID...” The Office Action refers to the abstract, col. 4 line 48 to col. 5 line 55, and col. 17 lines 8-45 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates claim 1. However, there is no mention of a logical network having a logical network ID in the cited passages. Thus, the cited reference does not anticipate nor make obvious the invention as claimed in Claim 1, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 21 teaches “formatting a message for transmission on the shared media from the sending device to the receiving device...” The Office Action refers to the communications manager in figure 2 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates claim 21. However, there is no indication from the cited figure that the communications manager formats a message for transmission on a shared media.

Claim 21 further teaches “a source logical network ID field configurable to contain the logical network ID of the logical network of which the sending device is a member...” The Office Action refers to col. 31 line 38 to col. 32 line 53 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited

reference anticipates claim 21. However, the cited passages make no reference to a source logical network ID as claimed in Applicants' claim 21.

Claim 21 further teaches "a source device ID field configurable to contain the logical device identifier," and "a destination logical network ID field configurable to contain the logical network ID of which the receiving device is a member..." The Office Action refers to figure 2, the abstract, col. 32 line 53 to col. 33 line 54, and col. 34 line 45 to col. 35 line 46 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates claim 21. However, the cited passages do not disclose any of the limitations as claimed in Applicants' claim 21.

Claim 21 further teaches "a destination device ID field configurable to contain the logical device ID of the receiving device, a message type field configurable to contain a code indicative of information contained in the message, and a message data field configurable to contain data..." The Office Action refers to col. 5 line 38 to col. 6 line 61, col. 7 line 31 to col. 8 line 67, and col. 39 line 10 to col. 40 line 65 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates claim 21. However, the cited passages do not disclose any of the limitations as claimed in Applicants' claim 21. Thus, *Maggenti* does not anticipate nor make obvious Applicants' claim 21, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 26 teaches "an address space arbiter (ASA) coupled to the shared media, the ASA being configurable to form a logical network with zero or more devices connected to the shared media..." The Office Action refers to figures 1 and 2, col. 4 line 48 to col. 5 line 55, and col. 17 lines 8-45 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates claim 26. However, the cited passages do not disclose the address space arbiter as claimed in Applicants' claim 26.

Claim 26, as amended, teaches "an acquisition authority... configured to the selectively authorize the ASA to add a device to the logical network..." The Office Action refers to reference number 228 in figure 2 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates the arbitration authority of claim 26. Reference number 228 refers to a security manager "which performs key management, user authentication, and related tasks to support secure nets." (col. 5 line 66 to col. 6 line 2) The security manager does not authorize an address space arbiter to add a device to a logical network as claimed in Applicants' claim 26.

Claim 26 further teaches that "the logical network has a logical network ID, [and that] the ASA and any devices of the logical network are configured to be responsive to messages sent over the shared media that are addressed to the logical network." The Office Action refers to

col. 5 line 38 to col. 6 line 61, col. 7 line 31 to col. 8 line 67, and col. 39 line 10 to col. 40 line 65 of *Maggenti* as evidence that the cited reference anticipates the arbitration authority of claim 26. However, the cited passages do not teach the limitations of Applicants' claim 26. Thus, *Maggenti* does not anticipate nor make obvious Applicants' claim 26, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 39 is directed to a computer-readable medium and claim 46 is directed to a system for implementing a network of devices connected to a shared media. Claims 39 and 46 include substantially the same limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 39 and 46 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Rejection of Claims 2-9, 16-20, 22-25, 27-38, 40-44, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 2-9, 16-20, 22-25, 27-38, 40-44, and 47 are rejected as being anticipated by *Maggenti*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action references large portions of text in the *Maggenti* patent as evidence that the cited reference anticipates claims 2-9, 16-20, 22-25, 27-38, 40-44, and 47. However, the cited passages do not recite any of the limitations of Applicants' claims. Thus, *Maggenti* does not anticipate nor make obvious Applicants' claims 2-9, 16-20, 22-25, 27-38, 40-44, and 47, and notice to that effect is solicited. Furthermore, claims 2-9, 16-20, 22-25, 27-38, 40-44, and 47 are dependent on allowable base claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 21, 26, 39 and 46 are allowable. Should these arguments not be persuasive, Applicants respectfully request the next Office Action to particularly point out the specific locations within the *Maggenti* reference for each claim.

Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected as being unpatentable over *Maggenti* in view of *Vert*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 10 teaches "assigning a logical device identifier to the device; assigning the logical network ID as a logical network identifier to the device; adding the device's logical device

identifier and globally unique identifier to acquired device table; and removing the device's logical device identifier and globally unique identifier from the announced device table.”

The Office Action cites col. 17 line 7 to col. 18 line 49 of *Maggenti* to show that the cited reference anticipates the first two limitations of claim 10. However, *Maggenti* does not disclose assigning a logical device identifier to the device and assigning the logical network ID as a logical network identifier to the device as described in Applicants' claim 10. The Office Action further cites col. 11 line 10 to col. 12 line 57 and col. 13 lines 15-61 of *Vert* to show that the cited reference discloses adding a globally unique identifier to an acquired device table. However, *Vert* does not disclose adding a globally unique identifier to an acquired device table as described in Applicants' claim 10. Thus, the cited references do not anticipate the invention as claimed in Claim 10, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 11-15 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, as discussed above, claims 1 and 39 are allowable as written. Thus, claims 11-15 and 45 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 39 are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, pending Claims 1-47 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Line: 206.342.6254

TPS/JJF/tg